Case 1:15-cv-00036-JM Document 1 Filed 03/16/15 Page 1 of 5

US DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS NORTHERN DIVISION

MAR 1 6 2015

Lawrie Brewer,

Plaintiff,

: Civil Action No.: 1.15-CV-036-JM

v.

: COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR

Credit Protection Association; and DOES 1-10, : JURY TRIAL

inclusive,

Defendants.

: This case assigned to District Judge

and to Magistrate Judge.

#### **COMPLAINT**

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Lawrie Brewer, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

### **JURISDICTION**

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. (the "FDCPA").
  - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

#### **PARTIES**

- 4. Plaintiff, Lawrie Brewer ("Plaintiff"), is a person residing in Mountain View, Arkansas.
- 5. Defendant Credit Protection Association ("CPA"), is a Texas business entity with an address of 13355 Noel Road, Suite 2100, Dallas, Texas 75240, operating as a collection

agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), A.C.A. § 17-24-502(5)(A).

- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by CPA and whose identities are currently unknown to Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.
  - 7. CPA at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

#### **ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

#### A. The Debt

- 8. An individual other than Plaintiff (the "Debtor") allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to an original creditor (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes, which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5) and A.C.A. § 17-24-502(4).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to CPA for collection, or CPA was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2) and A.C.A. § 17-24-502(1).

#### B. CPA Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 12. Within the last year, CPA contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt from "Lexis Ford" (the "Debtor").
- 13. On multiple occasions, Plaintiff informed CPA that she was not the Debtor and that it was calling the wrong number.
  - 14. Nevertheless, CPA continued to harass Plaintiff with collection calls.

#### C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

- 15. Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct.
- 16. As a direct consequence of Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

# <u>COUNT I</u> <u>VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT – 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.</u>

- 17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 18. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff in connection with collection of the Debt.
- 19. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged Plaintiff in telephone conversations with the intent to annoy and harass Plaintiff.
- 20. Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect the Debt.
- 21. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA.
  - 22. Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

# <u>COUNT II</u> <u>VIOLATIONS OF THE ARKANSAS FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT – A.C.A. § 17-24-501, et seq.</u>

- 23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 24. Defendants' conduct violated A.C.A. § 17-24-505(a) in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 25. Defendants' conduct violated A.C.A. § 17-24-505(b)(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.
- 26. Defendants' conduct violated A.C.A. § 17-24-507(a) in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.
- 27. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the AFDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
  - 28. Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

- Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) and A.C.A. § 17-24-512(a)(1);
- Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) and
   A.C.A. § 17-24-512(a)(2)(A);
- Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) and A.C.A. § 17-24-512(3);
- 4. Actual damages pursuant to A.C.A. 4-88-113(f);

- Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to A.C.A. 4-88-113(f);
- 6. Punitive damages; and
- 7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

## TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: March 9, 2015

Sergei Lemberg, Esq.

Respectfully submitted

LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.

1100 Summer Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Stamford, CT 06905

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424

Attorneys for Plaintiff